



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,133	02/28/2002	Lon Klein	30103/00301	3618

7590 02/09/2005

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
17th Floor
100 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038

EXAMINER

DUONG, THANH P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1764

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/090,133

Applicant(s)

KLEIN, LON

Examiner

Tom P Duong

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 18, 20 and 23-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 20 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's remarks filed on November 23, 2004 have been carefully considered. Claims 1, 18, 20, and 23-27 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 18, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein (5,772,525) in view of Hardness (1,677,099). Regarding claims 1 and 23-24, Klein discloses a putter (14) comprising: a grip (23), a shaft (12) having a first end and a second end, wherein the grip (23) is attached to the first end of the shaft; a hosel 16 attached to the second end of the shaft (Col. 5, lines 1-10); a head attached to the hosel (Fig. 2), the head having a striking face (24); and an alignment feature of the putter adapted to ensure correct assembly of the head onto the shaft (Figs. 4-8, Col. 2, lines 52-57 and Col. 7, lines 19-49). Klein fails to disclose a grip having an anatomically correct shape to promote proper grasping of the putter and the handle is oriented in a selected direction when gripped. Hardness teaches the handle 22 with substantially semi-elliptical shape and the flat surface of the handle snugly fit into the hands of a player and provide a firm grip (page 1, lines 39-51) and the handle also provides proper

Art Unit: 1764

positioning of the club. Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Klein to modify the grip of Klein with the grip configuration of Hardness to provide a player with a firm grip and facilitate the positioning and orientation of the club head. Regarding claim 18, Klein discloses the shaft is made from one of a polymer material and a composite material (Col. 6, lines 9-15) but is silent with respect to material construction of the grip, hosel, and head. It is conventional to fabricate club parts with polymer and composite material and it would have been obvious to do so here for its structural strength, light weight construction and eased in molding. Regarding claim 24, Klein discloses a parallax collimating device (sighting line as shown on Figure 7) of the head for visually indicating to the golfer when a preferred stance is maintained (Col. 3, lines 39-44 and Col. 7, lines 34-49).

4. Claims 20 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied references (Klein '525 in view of Hardness '099) as applied to claims 1 and 23 above, and further in view of Karns (3,075,768) and Florian (3,679,207) and Simmons (5,489,097). Regarding claim 20 and 25, Klein fails to show a first balancing weight disposed in the grip and a second balancing weight disposed in the head. Klein teaches a golf club head with weight inserted in the grip to provide proper balance in the club (Figs. 1 and 4, Col. 1, lines 9-25). Likewise, Florian teaches a weight 15 is added to the upper end of the handle 16 to provide a balanced putter (Col. 1, lines 71-75). Simmons teaches the solid weights 40 and 41 are inserted in the putter head (Fig. 5) to

Art Unit: 1764

reduce the incidence of gyration and reduce vibrations and provide a balanced putter (Col. 3, lines 62-67). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Karns and/or Florian and Simmons to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the putter head of the applied references with weight disposed in the grip portion as taught by Karns and/or Florian to provide a balanced putter head and weight disposed in the putter head as taught by Simmons in order to reduce twisting of the putter head, reduce vibrations, and provide a balanced putter head.

Regarding claim 26, the modification of the putter head of Klein in view Simmons (weights 30, 40, 41) facilitates the adjustment of the center of gravity along the three axis. Regarding claim 27, the modification of the putter head of the applied references (Klein '525 in view of Hardness '099) in view Simmons provides a balanced putter system .

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/23/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues neither Klein or Hardness, alone or in combination, teach or disclose a putter comprising " an alignment feature of the putter adapted to ensure correct of the head onto the shaft." Examiner respectfully disagrees because Klein discloses the importance of having a proper interrelationships or alignment between the putter shaft, heads, and grips to facilitate alignment of the striking face with the golf ball (Col. 2, lines 52-57) and Klein further discloses the cooperative special relationship between the putter head 14 and shaft 12 determined by the configuration of hosel 16, provide means

Art Unit: 1764

for accurately aligning the sweet spot of the putter's striking face with the ball (Col. 7, lines 43-49). Applicant further points out the specific alignment feature 118 including a unidirectional shape of the bottom portion of the hosel 108, cooperating with a correspondingly shape recess formed in the head 104 of the claimed invention. It is noted such features upon which applicant relies above are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1764


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom P Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-2794. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tom Duong
January 24, 2005

TD


Glenn Caldarola
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700